



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,603	12/29/2000	Michael Sweetser	SweeM1/2K36	8550

7590 03/22/2005  
C. Emmett Pugh  
Pugh/Associates  
Patent and Trademark Attorneys  
82 N. Main St.  
Suffield, CT 06078-2102

EXAMINER
----------

MA, JOHNNY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,603

Applicant(s)

SWEETSER, MICHAEL

Examiner

Johnny Ma

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

Please note that claims 12-37 have been renumbered 11-36 in accordance with 37 CFR

1.75(f), the claims are rejected accordingly.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Bengelt et al. (US 2002/0087992 A1).

As to claim 1, note the Cohen reference discloses a mobile display system.

The claimed "using a number of multiple, wheeled vehicles, each having a closed body having four side walls – one on each side, a front and a rear wall, and a roof, all interconnected together to form the closed body of the vehicle" is met by "transporter 12 may also comprise a self-propelled vehicle, cart, trailer or other device upon which the display is carried from place to place and to which the display may be mounted for viewing" (Cohen 3:48-52) including a truck, bus, or trailer (Cohen 3:64-65) wherein a plurality of transporters operate on the disclosed system (Cohen 5:21-34, 53-57).

The claimed "with each vehicle having at least one video display located adjacent to at least one side wall of the vehicle viewable from the exterior of the vehicle through the one side walls of the closed body" is met by display "may be secured to the roof of an automobile or mounted across the sides or rear of a truck, bus or trailer" (Cohen 3:64-65).

Art Unit: 2614

The claimed “moving on their own wheels the video display wheeled vehicles to the substantially spaced locations” is met by “[t]he system 10 includes an operator (hereinafter referred to as a transporter 12) employed to display and transport a mobile viewable changeable display 14” (Cohen 3:46-48) wherein the disclosed truck, bus, or trailer satisfies the claimed wheeled vehicles..

Note that the Cohen reference discloses a self-propelled vehicles such as a truck, bus, or trailer. However, the Cohen reference is silent as to “with each vehicle having a lockable door leading into the closed body.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a vehicle to have lockable doors for the purpose of security and protecting contents within the vehicle. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen self-propelled vehicle accordingly for the above stated advantages.

Also note the Cohen reference discloses receiving content via “[a] communications link 26 interconnecting the controller 16 and the station may comprise a conventional cellular link, radio signal broadcast communication or other known wireless communication system” (Cohen 4:26-29). However, the Cohen reference does not specifically disclose “with each vehicle having a satellite antenna capable of receiving video signals from a space-based, geo-synchronous satellite” and digitally communicating with a land-based video server. Now note the Bengault et al. reference that discloses a method and apparatus for bi-directional data services and live television programming to mobile platforms. The claimed “with each vehicle having a satellite antenna capable of receiving video signals from a space-based, geo-synchronous satellite” is met by “mobile system incorporates a suitable antenna system for effecting bi-directional

Art Unit: 2614

communications with its assigned [satellite] transponder” (Bengeult [0019]) wherein mobile system receives video programming (Bengeult [0016]). The claimed “digitally communicating with a land-based video server, along with associated electronic equipment located inside the closed body” is met by ground station 22 for transmitting data content to the satellites (Bengeult [0027]) and receiver subsystem 66 for receiving transmitted content (Bengeult [0031]).

Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen wireless communication system with the Bengeult et al. satellite communication system for the purpose of providing video content to a mobile vehicle using a known wireless communication system capable of facilitating transfers and alleviate the need for a network of towers to be constructed to facilitate communication.

The claimed “thereafter concurrently displaying on the vehicle video display screens of the substantially spaced vehicles the same video signal emanating from the satellite from the land-based video server to viewers located on the exterior of the vehicles” is met by the Cohen and Bengeult et al. combination as discussed above wherein content is displayed on the exterior of the vehicle according to zones (Cohen 4:34-56) and transporters in the same zone display the same content (Cohen 5:21-33).

As to claim 4, the claimed “moving at least some of the vehicles to another locations and repeating step ‘c’” is met by display is carried from place to place (Cohen 3:46-52).

As to claim 5, the claimed “separately and independently sending out signal from each of the video display vehicle to effect subsequent transmission from the geo-synchronous satellite” is met by vehicle controller communicating with fixed station to receive new content for display (Cohen 4:50-56).

Art Unit: 2614

3. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Bengault et al. (US 2002/0087992 A1) and Gambuti et al. (US 4,701,627).

As to claim 2, the claimed “moving the trailers to their respective locations by means of another motorized vehicle” is met by [t]he transporter 12 may also comprise a self-propelled vehicle, cart, trailer or other device upon which the display is carried from place to place and to which the display may be mounted for viewing” (Cohen 3:48-52) wherein another motorized vehicle is inherent to the moving of trailers from place to place.

Also note, the Cohen reference discloses a system for displaying data on the exterior of a vehicle. However, the Cohen reference is silent as to an operator and leaving the moved trailer for a period of time. Now note the Gambuti et al. reference that also discloses a mobile display apparatus. The claimed “setting up the electronic equipment via the respective vehicle’s operator to cause the video signal received [to be displayed]” is met by “[t]his portion of the console accommodates the operator of the system and is positioned adjacent to the side door 30 of the van so that the operator can enter through this door and reach the rear of the console” (Gambuti 2:3-7) wherein it is inherent that such an operator set up the equipment for display. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen and Bengault et al. combination with the Gambuti et al. operator for the purpose of providing a means of setting up/ensuring equipment is set up for display. The claimed “from the satellite through the vehicle satellite antenna” is met by the Cohen and Bengault et al. combination as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 teaching the receipt of programming through a vehicle satellite antenna.

Art Unit: 2614

The claimed “leaving the moved trailers at their respective locations for a period of time” is met by “[t]he van 10 thus described is used by being driven to a location, for example a public swimming pool or playground or the like at which large numbers of people especially young people might be congregated” (Gambuti 3:62-65). Therefore the examiner submits that it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen mobile display system with the Gambuti leaving the mobile display system at their respective locations for a period of time for the purpose of displaying content to a larger audience where such content may be viewed for a prolonged period of time, thus increasing audience exposure.

Note the Cohen, Bengelt et al. and Gambuti et al. combination discloses a mobile display apparatus that may be left at a particular location for a period of time. However, the Cohen, Bengelt et al. and Gambuti et al. combination is silent as to leaving the mobile display apparatus “while the respective operator is away from one or more of the trailers, during which time the respective lockable door is locked.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of content display to allow for at least partial automation wherein the apparatus may be left unattended by the operator for a period of time for the purpose of promoting efficiency wherein an operator may perform other duties while such content is being displayed. The examiner further gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to lock a an unattended vehicle for security by protecting the contents in the vehicle from theft or vandalism. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

Art Unit: 2614

Cohen, Bengelt et al. and Gambuti et al. combination accordingly for the above stated advantages.

As to claim 3, note the Cohen reference discloses a system for displaying data on the exterior of a vehicle. However, the Cohen reference is silent as to an operator and leaving the moved vehicles for a period of time. Now note the Gambuti et al. reference that also discloses a mobile display apparatus.

The claimed "setting up the electronic equipment via the respective vehicle's operator to cause the video signal received from the satellite through the vehicle satellite antenna to be displayed on the vehicle's video display" is met by "[t]his portion of the console accommodates the operator of the system and is positioned adjacent to the side door 30 of the van so that the operator can enter through this door and reach the rear of the console" (Gambuti 2:3-7) wherein it is inherent that such an operator set up the equipment for display. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen and Bengelt et al. combination with the Gambuti et al. operator for the purpose of providing a means of setting up/ensuring equipment is set up for display. Note the claimed "from the satellite through the vehicle satellite antenna" is met by the Cohen and Bengelt et al. combination as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 teaching the receipt of programming through a vehicle satellite antenna.

The claimed "leaving the moved vehicles at their respective locations for a period of time" is met by "[t]he van 10 thus described is used by being driven to a location, for example a public swimming pool or playground or the like at which large numbers of people especially young people might be congregated" (Gambuti 3:62-65). Therefore the examiner submits that it would



Art Unit: 2614

have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen mobile display system with the Gambuti leaving the mobile display system at their respective locations for a period of time for the purpose of displaying content to a larger audience where such content may be viewed for a prolonged period of time, thus increasing audience exposure.

Note the Cohen, Bengelt et al. and Gambuti et al. combination discloses a mobile display apparatus that may be left at a particular location for a period of time. However, the Cohen, Bengelt et al. and Gambuti et al. combination is silent as to leaving the mobile display apparatus "while the respective operator is away from one or more of the vehicles, during which time the respective lockable door is locked." Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art of content display to allow for at least partial automation wherein the apparatus may be left unattended by the operator for a period of time for the purpose of promoting efficiency wherein an operator may perform other duties while such content is being displayed. The examiner further gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to lock a an unattended vehicle for security by protecting the contents in the vehicle from theft or vandalism. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen, Bengelt et al. and Gambuti et al. combination accordingly for the above stated advantages.

4. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Bengelt et al. (US 2002/0087992 A1) and Crocker et al. (US 6,606,033 B1).

As to claim 6, the claimed “sending the signals via the Internet.” Note the Cohen reference discloses “[a] communications link 26 interconnecting the controller 16 and the station may comprise a conventional cellular link, radio signal broadcast communication or other known wireless communication system. Alternately, a communication link may be established with the stations through a cabled telephone central station network ” (Cohen 4:26-32). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the format data is communicated, specifically over the Internet. Now note the Crocker et al. reference that discloses an information system. The claimed “sending the signals via the Internet” is met by “data processor 60 may also be in communication with a further communication channel, shown as a cable 50, but which may also be a radio link to another computer such as a internet service provider. This further communication link can be used by a system administrator to refresh the data held in the memory 64 and also to support bi-directional transfer of data” (Crocker 12:41-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen communications link with the Crocker et al. Internet communications link for the purpose of using a widely accessible network to communicate with a server using existing network infrastructure as well as provide greater flexibility in acquiring content for display.

As to claim 7, the claimed “sending the signals via the Internet using a wireless connection from the vehicle to the Internet” is met by the Cohen, Bengelut et al., and Crocker et al. combination as discussed in the rejection of claim 6 wherein communication occurs via a wireless Internet connection.

As to claim 8, the claimed “sending the signals via the Internet using a hard-wired connection form the vehicle to the Internet” is met by the Cohen, Bengelut et al., and Crocker et

Art Unit: 2614

al. combination as discussed in the rejection of claim 6 wherein communication may occur over a cabled network.

As to claim 9, the claimed “sending the signals via two-way communication via the satellite antenna with the geo-synchronous satellite” is met by the Cohen and Bengault et al. combination as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 wherein “mobile system incorporates a suitable antenna system for effecting bi-directional communications with its assigned [satellite] transponder” (Bengault [0019])

5. Claims 10, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Bengault et al. (US 2002/0087992 A1) and Gaspar (US 5,263,756).

As to claim 10, note the Cohen reference that discloses a mobile display system. The claimed “a wheeled vehicle of the type from the group consisting of a closed body trailer, a closed body van and a closed body truck, said wheeled vehicle having a closed body having four walls – one on each side, a front wall and a rear wall, and a roof, all interconnected together to form said closed body of the vehicle” is met by “[t]he transporter 12 may also comprise a self-propelled vehicle, cart, trailer or other device upon which the display is carried from place to place and to which the display may be mounted for viewing” (Cohen 3:48-52).

However, the Cohen reference is silent as to “having a lockable, entry door leading into said closed body.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a vehicle to have lockable doors for the purpose of security and protecting contents within the vehicle. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2614

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen self-propelled vehicle accordingly for the above stated advantages.

Also note the Cohen reference discloses receiving content via “[a] communications link 26 interconnecting the controller 16 and the station may comprise a conventional cellular link, radio signal broadcast communication or other known wireless communication system” (Cohen 4:26-29). However, the Cohen reference does not specifically disclose “a satellite antenna mounted on the vehicle and being capable of receiving video signals from a space-based, geo-synchronous satellite digitally communicating with a land-based server, and associated electronic equipment connected to said antenna and located inside said closed body.” Now note the Bengault et al. reference that discloses a method and apparatus for bi-directional data services and live television programming to mobile platforms. The claimed “a satellite antenna mounted on the vehicle and being capable of receiving video signals from a space-based, geo-synchronous satellite” is met by “mobile system incorporates a suitable antenna system for effecting bi-directional communications with its assigned [satellite] transponder” (Bengault [0019]) wherein mobile system receives video programming (Bengault [0016]). The claimed “digitally communicating with a land-based video server, along with associated electronic equipment connected to said antenna and located inside the closed body” is met by ground station 22 for transmitting data content to the satellites (Bengault [0027]) and receiver subsystem 66 for receiving transmitted content (Bengault [0031]). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen wireless communication system with the Bengault et al. satellite communication system for the purpose of providing video content to a mobile vehicle using a

Art Unit: 2614

known wireless communication system capable of facilitating transfers and alleviate the need for a network of towers to be constructed to facilitate communication.

The claimed “at least one video display screen located adjacent to one of said side walls of the vehicle viewable from the exterior of the vehicle” is met by “[display] may be secured to the roof of an automobile or mounted across the front, sides, or rear of a truck, bus or trailer” (Cohen 3:63-65).

However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the manner in which the display is mounted to the vehicle. Now note the Gaspar reference that discloses an advertising vehicle. The claimed “through the one of said side walls of said closed body, said one of said side walls having a rectangular cut-out in its wall structure open to the interior of said closed body, said video display screen positioned against and aligned with said cut-out” is met by the cut out for display 2 as illustrated in Figure 1 (Gaspar). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen display with the Gaspar cut out mounted display for the purpose of providing a means for attaching the display to the vehicle.

The claimed “said video display screen being the only display screen viewable on that one of said sidewalls” is met by the mounting of a single display to various walls of the vehicle (Cohen 3:53-65).

As to claim 12, the claimed “a micro-computer sub-system associated with said video display screen sending video signals to said video display screen” is met by controller 16 is operatively connected to the display (Cohen 4:7-8) wherein the controller drives the display (Cohen 4:39-41).

Art Unit: 2614

As to claim 14, note the Cohen reference discloses a mobile display system on a vehicle. However, the Cohen reference is silent as to a power source for powering the disclosed display. Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to power electronic devices of a vehicle using a battery wherein it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement a battery with at least 200 amp hours and capable of powering the devices for at least 6 hours for the purpose of allowing viewers to watch programming or use other devices for a longer period of time without requiring constant recharging of the battery, such as in recreational vehicles. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen mobile display system accordingly for the purpose of providing a power source for powering the display and for powering the display for long periods of time in order to maximize the time that the displays may be in use without requiring a battery recharge.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Bengel et al. (US 2002/0087992 A1), Gaspar (US 5,263,756) and Crocker et al. (US 6,606,033 B1).

As to claim 11, the claimed "a connection to the Internet of the type from the group consisting of hard wired and wireless connections." Note the Cohen reference discloses "[a] communications link 26 interconnecting the controller 16 and the station may comprise a conventional cellular link, radio signal broadcast communication or other known wireless communication system. Alternately, a communication link may be established with the stations through a cabled telephone central station network" (Cohen 4:26-32). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the format data is communicated, specifically over the Internet. Now

Art Unit: 2614

note the Crocker et al. reference that discloses an information system. The claimed “a connection to the Internet” is met by “data processor 60 may also be in communication with a further communication channel, shown as a cable 50, but which may also be a radio link to another computer such as a internet service provider. This further communication link can be used by a system administrator to refresh the data held in the memory 64 and also to support bi-directional transfer of data” (Crocker 12:41-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen communications link with the Crocker et al. Internet communications link for the purpose of using a widely accessible network to communicate with a server using existing network infrastructure as well as provide greater flexibility in acquiring content for display. The claimed “of the type from the group consisting of hard wired and wireless connections” is met by the Cohen and Crocker et al. combination wherein Internet is accessed via wireless connection or cabled connection.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Bengelt et al. (US 2002/0087992 A1), Gaspar (US 5,263,756), Crocker et al. (US 6,606,033 B1), and Gambuti et al. (US 4,701,627).

As to claim 13, note the Cohen reference discloses receiving data from a fixed station and storing such data for subsequent playback (Cohen 4:34-43). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to a video source player from the group consisting of a CD player, a DVD player, a laser disk player and a video tape player.” Now note the Gambuti et al. reference that discloses a mobile display apparatus. The claimed video source player of a video content source containing video signals from the group consisting of a CD player, a DVD player, a laser disk player and a

Art Unit: 2614

video tape player, said video source player feeding the video signals from the content source to said video display screen displaying the video signals on said screen” is met by console includes various pieces of electronic equipment such as a TV tape recorder” (Gambutu 1:66-2:3) wherein content is displayed (Gambutu 3:65-4:1). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen display of stored content with the Gambuti TV tape recorder for the purpose of providing an additional source of content for display without requiring the download of content in instances where bi-directional communication may not be available.

8. Claims 15-17, 28-30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Gaspar (US 5,263,756).

As to claim 15, note the Cohen reference that discloses a mobile display system.

The claimed “obtaining a wheeled vehicle of standard make from one of the established vehicle manufacturers and being one of the types of the group consisting of a closed body trailer, a closed body van and a closed body truck, said wheeled vehicle having four side walls – one on each side, a front wall and a rear wall, and a roof, all interconnected together to form said closed body of the vehicle” is met by “[t]he transporter 12 may also comprise a self-propelled vehicle, cart, trailer or other device upon which the display is carried from place to place and to which the display may be mounted for viewing” (Cohen 3:48-52).

However, the Cohen reference is silent as to ““having a lockable, entry door leading into said closed body.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a vehicle to have lockable doors for the purpose of security and protecting contents within the vehicle. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of



Art Unit: 2614

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen self-propelled vehicle accordingly for the above stated advantages.

Note the Cohen reference discloses “[display] may be secured to the roof of an automobile or mounted across the front, sides or rear of a truck, bus or trailer” (Cohen 3:63-65) wherein the display may comprise a variety of known displays (Cohen 3:53-63). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the manner in which such displays are mounted, specifically by cut outs. Now note the Gaspar reference that discloses an advertising vehicle. The claimed “cutting out a rectangular piece out of and completely through at least one of said side walls of a size substantially equal to the size of a standard ‘off-the-shelf’ video display screen” is met by the cut out for display 2 as illustrated in Figure 1 (Gaspar). The claimed “with the cut-out being open to the interior of said closed body” is met by the displays open to the interior of the vehicle as illustrated in Figure 2 (Gaspar). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen display with the Gaspar cut out mounted display for the purpose of providing a means for attaching the display to the vehicle.

Note the Cohen reference discloses the use of a variety of known displays (Cohen 3:53-65) and the Gaspar reference discloses “[e]ach wall is formed of a variable number of television screens contained in a set of racks and inner structures” (Gaspar 1:47-49). However, the Cohen and Gaspar combination is silent as to a cut out of 15%. Nevertheless the examiner gives Official Notice that it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement displays of various sizes such as a display that occupies 15% of the total area and to use such a display for the purpose of facilitating advertising/content function within the context of usable space of one

Art Unit: 2614

side of the vehicle that is consistent with safety, community laws, or guidelines. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen and Gaspar combination accordingly for the above stated reasons.

The claimed “placing one such video display screen positioned against and aligned with said cut-out” is met by the Cohen and Gaspar combination as discussed above wherein a display is mounted in a cut out.

The claimed “said video display screen being the only display screen viewable on that one of said sidewalls” is met by the mounting of a single display to various walls of the vehicle (Cohen 3:53-65).

As to claim 16, please see rejection of claim 15.

As to claim 17, the claimed “providing the lockable, entry door in said one of said side walls adjacent to said cut-out.” Note the claimed “entry door in said one of said side walls adjacent to said cut-out” is met by the Cohen and Gaspar combination wherein an entry door adjacent to cut out is illustrated in Figure 1 (Gaspar). The claimed lockable entry door is met by that discussed in the rejection of claim 15.

As to claim 28, note the Cohen reference that discloses a mobile display system.

The claimed “a wheeled vehicle of standard make from one an established vehicle manufacturers and being one of the types of the group consisting of a closed body trailer, a closed body van and a closed body truck, said wheeled vehicle having four side walls – one on each side, a front wall and a rear wall, and a roof, all interconnected together to form said closed body of the vehicle” is met by “[t]he transporter 12 may also comprise a self-propelled vehicle, cart, trailer or other

Art Unit: 2614

device upon which the display is carried from place to place and to which the display may be mounted for viewing” (Cohen 3:48-52).

However, the Cohen reference is silent as to “having a lockable, entry door leading into said closed body.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a vehicle to have lockable doors for the purpose of security and protecting contents within the vehicle. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen self-propelled vehicle accordingly for the above stated advantages.

The claimed “at least one video display screen located adjacent to at least one side wall of the vehicle viewable from the exterior of the vehicle” is met by the “[display] may be secured to the roof of an automobile or mounted across the front, sides or rear of a truck, bus or trailer” (Cohen 3:63-65) wherein the display may comprise a variety of known displays (Cohen 3:53-63).

However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the manner in which such displays are mounted, specifically by cut outs. Now note the Gaspar reference that discloses an advertising vehicle.

The claimed “through the one of said side walls of said closed body, said one of said side walls having a rectangular cut-out in its wall structure” and “said video display screen positioned against and aligned with said cut-out” is met by the cut out for display 2 as illustrated in Figure 1 (Gaspar). The claimed “rectangular cut-out in its wall structure open to the interior of said closed body” is met by the displays open to the interior of the vehicle as illustrated in Figure 2 (Gaspar). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen display with the Gaspar

Art Unit: 2614

cut out mounted display for the purpose of providing a means for attaching the display to the vehicle.

The claimed “said video display screen being the only display screen viewable on that one of said sidewalls” is met by the mounting of a single display to various walls of the vehicle (Cohen 3:53-65).

Also note the Cohen reference discloses the use of a variety of known displays (Cohen 3:53-65) and the Gaspar reference discloses “[e]ach wall is formed of a variable number of television screens contained in a set of racks and inner structures” (Gaspar 1:47-49). However, the Cohen and Gaspar combination is silent as to a cut out of 15%. Nevertheless the examiner gives Official Notice that it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement displays of various sizes such as a display that occupies 15% of the total area and to use such a display for the purpose of facilitating advertising/content function within the context of usable space of one side of the vehicle that is consistent with safety, community laws, or guidelines. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen and Gaspar combination accordingly for the above stated reasons.

As to claim 29, please see rejection of claim 28.

As to claim 30, please see rejection of claim 28.

As to claim 32, the claimed “said lockable, entry door is located in said one of said side walls adjacent to said video display screen.” Note the claimed “entry door in said one of said side walls adjacent to said cut-out” is met by the Cohen and Gaspar combination wherein an

Art Unit: 2614

entry door adjacent to cut out is illustrated in Figure 1 (Gaspar). The claimed lockable entry door is met by that discussed in the rejection of claim 28.

As to claim 33, the claimed “the area of said one of said side walls adjacent to said video display screen is occupied by signage advertising the use of said vehicle for video signal display.” Note the Cohen reference discloses providing a video signal display service wherein advertisers may access a station to transfer content (Cohen 5:5-12). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to how the company running the display apparatus makes its services known to advertisers. Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to display information regarding ones services while services are being provided for the purpose of building a larger customer base and making the service known to others. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohn mobile display system accordingly for the above stated advantages.

As to claim 34, note the Cohen reference that discloses a mobile display system. The claimed “a wheeled vehicle being one of the types of the group consisting of a closed body trailer, a closed body van and a closed body truck; said wheeled vehicle having a closed body having four side walls – one on each side, a front wall and a rear wall, and a roof, all interconnected together to form said closed body of the vehicle” is met by “[t]he transporter 12 may also comprise a self-propelled vehicle, cart, trailer or other device upon which the display is carried from place to place and to which the display may be mounted for viewing” (Cohen 3:48-52).

Art Unit: 2614

However, the Cohen reference is silent as to ““having a lockable, entry door leading into said closed body.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a vehicle to have lockable doors for the purpose of security and protecting contents within the vehicle. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen self-propelled vehicle accordingly for the above stated advantages.

Furthermore, the Cohen reference is silent as to a power source for powering the disclosed display. Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to power electronic devices of a vehicle using a battery wherein it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement a battery with at least 200 amp hours and capable of powering the devices for at least 6 hours for the purpose of allowing viewers to watch programming or use other devices for a longer period of time without requiring constant recharging of the battery, such as in recreational vehicles. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen mobile display system accordingly for the purpose of providing a power source for powering the display and for powering the display for long periods of time in order to maximize the time that the displays may be in use without requiring a battery recharge.

The claimed “at least one video display screen located adjacent to at least one side wall of the vehicle viewable from the exterior of the vehicle” is met by “[display] may be secured to the roof of an automobile or mounted across the front, sides or rear of a truck, bus or trailer” (Cohen 3:63-65) wherein the display may comprise a variety of known displays (Cohen 3:53-63).

However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the manner in which such displays are mounted,

Art Unit: 2614

specifically by cut outs. Now note the Gaspar reference that discloses an advertising vehicle.

The claimed “through the one of said side walls of said closed body, said one of said side walls having a rectangular cut-out in its wall structure” and “said video display screen positioned against and aligned with said cut-out” is met by the cut out for display 2 as illustrated in Figure 1 (Gaspar). The claimed “rectangular cut-out in its wall structure being open to the interior of said closed body” is met by the displays open to the interior of the vehicle as illustrated in Figure 2 (Gaspar). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen display with the Gaspar cut out mounted display for the purpose of providing a means for attaching the display to the vehicle.

The claimed “said video display displaying a dynamic video signal from a content source” is met by display may present movable or still picture quality images (Cohen 3:53-65) wherein controller receives content from a fixed station (content source) (Cohen 4:24-49).

The claimed “said battery being electrically connected to said video display screen and being sufficient to power said video display screen and any needed associated electronic equipment for at least six (6) hours is met by that discussed above.

As to claim 35, the claimed “a micro-computer sub-system associated with said video display screen sending video signals to said video display screen, said computer sub-system being part of said associated electronic equipment” is met by controller 16 is operatively connected to the display (Cohen 4:7-8) wherein the controller drives the display (Cohen 4:39-41).

Art Unit: 2614

9. Claims 18-20, 22, 24-27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Gaspar (US 5,263,756) and Crocker et al. (US 6,606,033 B1).

As to claim 18, the claimed “installing equipment on said vehicle making a connection to the Internet.” Note the Cohen reference discloses “[a] communications link 26 interconnecting the controller 16 and the station may comprise a conventional cellular link, radio signal broadcast communication or other known wireless communication system. Alternately, a communication link may be established with the stations through a cabled telephone central station network ” (Cohen 4:26-32) with associated equipment. However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the format data is communicated, specifically over the Internet. Now note the Crocker et al. reference that discloses an information system. The claimed “a connection to the Internet” is met by “data processor 60 may also be in communication with a further communication channel, shown as a cable 50, but which may also be a radio link to another computer such as a internet service provider. This further communication link can be used by a system administrator to refresh the data held in the memory 64 and also to support bi-directional transfer of data” (Crocker 12:41-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen communications link and equipment with the Crocker et al. Internet communications link for the purpose of using a widely accessible network to communicate with a server using existing network infrastructure as well as provide greater flexibility in acquiring content for display.

As to claim 19, note the Cohen reference that discloses a mobile display system.



Art Unit: 2614

The claimed “a wheeled vehicle being one of the types of the group consisting of a closed body trailer, a closed body van and a closed body truck, said wheeled vehicle having a closed body having four side walls – one on each side, a front wall and a rear wall, and a roof, all interconnected together to form said closed body of the vehicle” is met by “[t]he transporter 12 may also comprise a self-propelled vehicle, cart, trailer or other device upon which the display is carried from place to place and to which the display may be mounted for viewing” (Cohen 3:48-52).

However, the Cohen reference is silent as to “having a lockable, entry door leading into said closed body.” Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a vehicle to have lockable doors for the purpose of security and protecting contents within the vehicle. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen self-propelled vehicle accordingly for the above stated advantages.

Note the Cohen reference discloses “[a] communications link 26 interconnecting the controller 16 and the station may comprise a conventional cellular link, radio signal broadcast communication or other known wireless communication system. Alternately, a communication link may be established with the stations through a cabled telephone central station network ” (Cohen 4:26-32) with associated equipment. However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the format data is communicated, specifically over the Internet. Now note the Crocker et al. reference that discloses an information system. The claimed “a connection to the Internet associated with said vehicle” is met by “data processor 60 may also be in communication with a further communication channel, shown as a cable 50, but which may also be a radio link to

Art Unit: 2614

another computer such as a internet service provider. This further communication link can be used by a system administrator to refresh the data held in the memory 64 and also to support bi-directional transfer of data" (Crocker 12:41-55) wherein a user 7- can surf the internet or establish other bi-directional communications, such as e-mail, telephone conversation or video link via the local data node 65 (Crocker 12:52-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen communications link with the Crocker et al. Internet communications link for the purpose of using a widely accessible network to communicate with a server using existing network infrastructure as well as provide greater flexibility in acquiring content for display. The claimed "at least one video display screen located adjacent to at least one side wall of the vehicle viewable from the exterior of the vehicle" is met by "[display] may be secured to the roof of an automobile or mounted across the front, sides or rear of a truck, bus or trailer" (Cohen 3:63-65) wherein the display may comprise a variety of known displays (Cohen 3:53-63). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the manner in which such displays are mounted, specifically by cut outs. Now note the Gaspar reference that discloses an advertising vehicle. The claimed "through the one of said side walls of said closed body, said one of said side walls having a rectangular cut-out in its wall structure open to the interior of said closed body, said video display screen positioned against and aligned with said cut-out" is met by the cut out for aligned display 2 as illustrated in Figure 1 (Gaspar). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen display with the Gaspar cut out mounted display for the purpose of providing a means for attaching the display to the vehicle.

Art Unit: 2614

The claimed "said video display displaying a dynamic video signal from a content source, said content source being a site associated with the Internet" is met by the Cohen and Crocker et al. combination as discussed above wherein the mobile vehicle may establish an Internet video link.

As to claim 20, the claimed "said connection to the Internet is a wireless connection" is met by that discussed in the rejection of claim 19 wherein the Cohen and Crocker et al. combination teaches an Internet connection over a wireless network.

As to claim 22, the claimed "a micro-computer sub-system associated with said video display screen sending video signals to said video display screen" is met by controller 16 is operatively connected to the display (Cohen 4:7-8) wherein the controller drives the display (Cohen 4:39-41).

As to claim 24, the claimed "said lockable, entry door is located in said one of said side walls adjacent to said video display screen. Note the claimed "entry door is located in said one of said side walls adjacent to said cut-out" is met by the Cohen and Gaspar combination wherein an entry door adjacent to cut out is illustrated in Figure 1 (Gaspar). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the entry door being lockable. Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a vehicle to have lockable doors for the purpose of security and protecting contents within the vehicle. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen self-propelled vehicle accordingly for the above stated advantages.

As to claim 25, note the Cohen reference discloses a mobile display system on a vehicle. However, the Cohen reference is silent as to a power source for powering the disclosed display. Nevertheless, the examiner gives Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to

Art Unit: 2614

power electronic devices of a vehicle using a battery wherein it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to implement a battery with at least 200 amp hours and capable of powering the devices for at least 6 hours for the purpose of allowing viewers to watch programming or use other devices for a longer period of time without requiring constant recharging of the battery, such as in recreational vehicles. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen mobile display system accordingly for the purpose of providing a power source for powering the display and for powering the display for long periods of time in order to maximize the time that the displays may be in use without requiring a battery recharge.

As to claim 26, the claimed "at least two video display screens with separate cut-outs for each, one on each side of said vehicle" is met by the Cohen and Gaspar combination as discussed in the rejection of claim 19 wherein display is mounted on both sides of the vehicle (Gaspar 1:43-49).

As to claim 27, the claimed "at least one additional video display screen located in a cut out in the rear wall of said vehicle" is met by the placing of display on the rear of the vehicle (Cohen 3:53-65) wherein the claimed cut out is met by the Cohen and Gaspar combination as discussed in the rejection of claim 19.

As to claim 31, the claimed "a connection to the Internet." Note the Cohen reference discloses "[a] communications link 26 interconnecting the controller 16 and the station may comprise a conventional cellular link, radio signal broadcast communication or other known wireless communication system. Alternately, a communication link may be established with the stations through a cabled telephone central station network " (Cohen 4:26-32) with associated

Art Unit: 2614

equipment. However, the Cohen reference is silent as to the format data is communicated, specifically over the Internet. Now note the Crocker et al. reference that discloses an information system. The claimed "a connection to the Internet" is met by "data processor 60 may also be in communication with a further communication channel, shown as a cable 50, but which may also be a radio link to another computer such as a internet service provider. This further communication link can be used by a system administrator to refresh the data held in the memory 64 and also to support bi-directional transfer of data" (Crocker 12:41-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen communications link and equipment with the Crocker et al. Internet communications link for the purpose of using a widely accessible network to communicate with a server using existing network infrastructure as well as provide greater flexibility in acquiring content for display.

10. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Gaspar (US 5,263,756), Crocker et al. (US 6,606,033 B1), and Bengelt et al. (US 2002/0087992 A1).

As to claim 21, the claimed "said connection to the Internet" is met by that discussed in the rejection of claim 19. However, the Cohen, Gaspar, and Crocker et al. combination is silent as to a satellite antenna. Now note the Bengelt et al. reference that discloses a method and apparatus for bi-directional data services and live television programming to mobile platforms. The claimed "satellite antenna mounted on the vehicle capable of receiving video signals from a space-based, geo-synchronous satellite" is met by "mobile system incorporates a suitable antenna system for effecting bi-directional communications with its assigned [satellite] transponder"

Art Unit: 2614

(Bengeult [0019]) wherein mobile system receives video programming (Bengeult [0016]). The claimed “digitally communicating with a land-based video server” is met by ground station 22 for transmitting data content to the satellites (Bengeult [0027]) and receiver subsystem 66 for receiving transmitted content (Bengeult [0031]). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen and Crocker et al. Internet wireless communication system with the Bengeult et al. satellite communication system for the purpose of providing video content to a mobile vehicle using a known wireless communication system capable of facilitating transfers and alleviate the need for a network of towers to be constructed to facilitate communication. The claimed video server associated with the Internet is met by the Cohen, Crocker et al., and Bengeult et al. combination as discussed above. The claimed “associated electronic equipment connected to said antenna and said video display screen and located inside said closed body” is met by the combination as discussed above wherein the vehicle contains a controller and display within the vehicle that is further connected to the communications link as illustrated in Figure 4 (Cohen).

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Gaspar (US 5,263,756), Crocker et al. (US 6,606,033 B1), and Gambuti et al. (US 4,701,627).

As to claim 23, note the Cohen reference discloses receiving data from a fixed station and storing such data for subsequent playback (Cohen 4:34-43). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to a video source player from the group consisting of a CD player, a DVD player, a laser disk player and a video tape player.” Now note the Gambuti et al. reference that discloses a

Art Unit: 2614

mobile display apparatus. The claimed video source player of a video content source containing video signals from the group consisting of a CD player, a DVD player, a laser disk player and a video tape player, said video source player feeding the video signals from the content source to said video display screen displaying the video signals on said screen” is met by console includes various pieces of electronic equipment such as a TV tape recorder” (Gambuti 1:66-2:3) wherein content is displayed (Gambuti 3:65-4:1). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen display of stored content with the Gambuti TV tape recorder for the purpose of providing an additional source of content for display without requiring the download of content in instances where bi-directional communication may not be available.

12. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen (US 6,236,330 B1) in further view of Gaspar (US 5,263,756), and Gambuti et al. (US 4,701,627).

As to claim 36, note the Cohen reference discloses receiving data from a fixed station and storing such data for subsequent playback (Cohen 4:34-43). However, the Cohen reference is silent as to a video source player from the group consisting of a CD player, a DVD player, a laser disk player and a video tape player.” Now note the Gambuti et al. reference that discloses a mobile display apparatus. The claimed video source player of a video content source containing video signals from the group consisting of a CD player, a DVD player, a laser disk player and a video tape player, said video source player feeding the video signals from the content source to said video display screen displaying the video signals on said screen” is met by console includes various pieces of electronic equipment such as a TV tape recorder” (Gambuti 1:66-2:3) wherein content is displayed (Gambuti 3:65-4:1). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have

Art Unit: 2614

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Cohen display of stored content with the Gambuti TV tape recorder for the purpose of providing an additional source of content for display without requiring the download of content in instances where bi-directional communication may not be available.

### ***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Bermel reference (US 6,674,357 B1) discloses an informational display system for mass transit systems and method for same.

The Schaphorts reference (US 5,767,795) discloses a GPS-based information system for vehicles.

The Richard reference (US 6,785,551 B1) discloses a method of providing dynamic regionally relevant data to a mobile environment.

The Granger et al. reference (US 2002/0007306 A1) discloses an in-vehicle promotions system.

The Moon reference (US 6,545,596 B1) discloses presenting information to mobile targets.

The Mankins et al. reference (US 2002/0164962 A1) discloses apparatuses, methods, and computer programs for displaying information on mobile units, with reporting by, and control of, such units.




Art Unit: 2614

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnny Ma whose telephone number is (571) 272-7351. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jm



JOHN MILLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600